## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 1
1	WASHINGTON STATE INSURANCE COMMISSION	
2		
3	PUBLIC MEETING	
4	IN THE MATTER OF	
5	THE PROPOSED CONVERSION OF PREMERA BLUE CROSS	
6	TO A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION	
7		
8	October 15, 2002	
9	at	
10	Red Lion Inn	
11	100 Columbia Street	
12	Vancouver, Washington	
13		
14		
15		
16	Taken Before:	
17	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR	
	Certified Court Reporter	
18	of	
	CAPITOL PACIFIC REPORTING	
19	2401 Bristol Court S.W.	
	Olympia, WA 98502	
20	360.352.2054	
	e-mail: capitolpacific@atg.com	
21	www.capitolpacificreporter.com	
22		
23		
24		
25		

## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 2
1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Mike Kreidler - Insurance Commissioner	3,27,30,33,38
4	Jim Odiorne - Assistant Insurance Commissioner	4
5	Rusty Fallis - Assistant Attorney General	8
6	Gubby Barlow - CEO Premera Blue Cross	12
7	Yori Milo - Premera Blue Cross Executive VP	17
8		
	Public Comment	
9		
10	Mr. Ian Timm	23
11	Dr. Todd Bernstein	28
12	Mr. George Young	31
13	Mr. Andrew Fallat	33
14	Mr. Mike Becker	37
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 3 1 PROCEEDINGS (Tuesday, October 15, 2002, at 6:04 p.m.) 3 4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Good evening. Welcome 5 to this meeting. I'm Mike Kreidler, Insurance 6 Commissioner, and joining me this evening is Mr. Jim 7 Odiorne, Deputy Commissioner in the Office of Insurance 8 Commissioner and Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis to my left. I want to thank you for coming tonight and 10 11 participating in this forum. The reason for this forum 12 meeting tonight is that on May 30th, Premera Blue Cross notified us, me specifically, of their intent to convert 13 14 from a nonprofit to a for-profit corporation. 15 ultimately will act as the judge as to whether that should be approved and how it would affect consumers of 16 17 the State of Washington. However, tonight we're going to -- I will refrain 18 19 from talking about the merits of the proposal. My 20 principal concerns are going to be that consumers are not 21 harmed by a conversion and that the potential impact on 22 Premera's solvency is not one that would hurt consumers 23 and hurt their solvency. And in addition to that, I'm 24 going to be obtaining an accurate valuation of Premera's 25 assets.

Page 4

This evening it is critical that we hear from the public. This is very early in the process. We anticipate that there will be another round of meetings later on. However, this evening we're going to keep our presentations to a minimum so that we can hear from the public.

We're going to begin with a ten-minute presentation from Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne followed by Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis, who will speak for ten minutes, and then for 15 minutes we're going to hear from Premera Blue Cross as they describe their specific proposal. Then we open it up for public comment.

And I'm going to begin right now by turning to

Assist -- excuse me -- Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim

Odiorne.

MR. ODIORNE: Thank you, Commissioner. I would like to offer my thanks to you -- excuse me -- for coming tonight. The Commissioner has asked me to lead the review team, and your information is part of what we're putting together that will help make the decision.

As the Commissioner indicated, Premera made the filing in late May. They filed what we call a "Form A" in regulatory parlance, that is, a notice of a change of control whenever as much as 10 percent of a company's

Page 5

control is changed. On average, we do two or three

Form A filings a year. And we have done some conversions
in the past, but this particular transaction is the
largest Form A and the largest conversion we've had to
deal with.

Within this particular Form A filing are a number of different transactions. Each has to be reviewed individually for compliance with the law, and then they have to be reviewed as a whole. We're looking at the formation of several companies, changing control of several companies, internal intercompany agreements that have to be approved, a number of other transactions.

The Commissioner's primary authority in this area is the Health Carrier Holding Company Act, which is a fairly new statute adopted within the last couple of years.

Under this act, the Form A cannot be approved without a formal hearing.

And as the Commissioner indicated, he will act as the judge in that formal hearing. And because of that role, we've had to limit access to certain information that will be developed within the Department and presented to the Commissioner at a later time. We talk about walling off particular parts of the staff so that they can help the review team develop a recommendation for the Commissioner at a later time.

Page 6

We've retained a number of consultants to help us review this transaction. We have experts in the area of investment banking, actuarial analysis, accounting and tax matters, and legal analysis. Each of the apparent successful bidders has had prior experience in at least one conversion. We met with them yesterday, and they've all worked together. They all have other experience under their belt, which will actually make the review go faster.

We will work very closely with those consultants to develop a recommendation for the Commissioner at the final hearing. We have asked each of the consultants to prepare an executive summary of their options and opinions, and those will be made available to the public as soon as we can.

At one point we were talking about a time line that called for conclusion of this process before the end of December of this year. We've come to find that that time line just will not work. We have not been able to reach a final contract yet with the consultants. They need time to do their work and do it very well. We told them all yesterday, "Your work's not done until we think it's a good product, so you may have to go back a couple times."

But with that, we're looking at getting at least a

Page 7

preliminary report from the consultants early in December. We'll follow that with another round of public forums such as this after the public's had an opportunity to look at what the consultants produce. And then at a later point, after there's been an opportunity for prefiled testimony, a final hearing will be held.

It's our intention to make as much information as possible public. Part of that is that everything that we can is put on our web site. It's my understanding that Premera has a goodly portion of this on their web site. And we will add to it as we go. The testimony from the three prior forums like this is either on the web site or soon will be. I know two of them were and maybe the third one is already. The prefile testimony will go there. Everything that we can legally release will go on the web site so that the public has access to it.

Our consultants, in fact, yesterday suggested that there ought to be a library all over the state for all of this information. I'm not sure that's going to happen, but we will work within the bounds that we can to make sure that you have information and you can come back with additional comments for us.

Thank you for coming tonight. Thank you, Commissioner

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Odiorne.

Now I turn to Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis.

MR. FALLIS: Thank you, Commissioner Kreidler.

On behalf of Attorney General Gregoire, I want to extend her regrets at her inability to be here tonight. She had hoped to attend, but she's had to spend most of the last couple weeks out of the state in connection with negotiations over some multistate litigation which was finally settled, and which you may have read about in the last couple of days.

I'm going to spend just a few minutes describing the primary roles that the Office of the Attorney General will play in connection with the proposed conversion. There are three principle roles, and to a greater or lesser degree, these all will be going on at the same time.

One role will be to serve as the legal advisor to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. As is the case with other state agencies, the Commissioner's Office receives legal counsel and litigation support from the Attorney General's Office. We have lawyers on our staff who will be available to provide legal advice to Commissioner Kreidler in his role as the final decision-maker with respect to those things that are within his jurisdiction. We have a separate group of lawyers who will be available to assist the

Page 9

Commissioner's staff in the adjudicative hearing that Deputy Commissioner Odiorne referred to.

The separation of our staff parallels the structuring of the Commissioner's staff, and it reflects the requirement from the State Administrative Procedure Act that the final decision-maker in an administrative hearing and that decision-maker's lawyer be different from the agency staff members and lawyers who are participating as parties and advocates in that hearing.

A second role that the Attorney General's Office will play will be to review potential antitrust issues and anticompetitive effects of the proposed conversion. The Insurance Holding Company Act specifically calls for the Attorney General's Office and the Commissioner's Office to confer on those issues.

There is a group of lawyers in my office who are dedicated to addressing antitrust issues, and they will review the proposed conversion and make their findings and their concerns, if any, known to the Commissioner's staff. Depending on what they conclude, it's possible that those lawyers may seek to intervene formally as a party in the adjudicative hearing.

The third primary role that the Office of the Attorney General will play will be to review what I'll call the foundation-related issues. Premera's proposed

Page 10

conversion involves, among other things, the dissolution of certain nonprofit corporations, the creation of some new nonprofit corporations, including a couple of charitable organizations, and through a series of transactions, the endowment of those charitable organizations for the purpose of carrying on certain healthcare-related initiatives.

Under the Washington Nonprofit Corporation Act, where there is a proposal to dissolve a corporation, and that corporation holds assets which by law must be used only for charitable or similar public benefit purposes, then Attorney General's Office must approve a plan to dispose of those assets. In this case, those parts of the transaction that involve the dissolutions of the nonprofit corporations and the establishment of successor charitable organizations will require the approval of the Attorney General's Office.

Our review in this respect will consist primarily of looking at two primary issues. One will be the valuation of assets, in other words, making sure that the amount of the endowment that's created, if there is to be a conversion, is appropriate.

The second major area of inquiry will be to look at the structure and governance of the charitable organizations and the related other nonprofit

Page 11

organizations that are created, to make sure that they are truly independent and, therefore, capable of carrying out of the public benefit purpose that the law requires them to carry out.

I want to mention just a couple of logistical items. The Attorney General's Office has a phone line available through which you can leave messages for us with respect to this conversion. If you have comments or concerns or there's information you think that we ought to be considering in connection with our role in reviewing the conversion, then you can leave a message 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, and that number is (360)586-8813. We also have an e-mail line if you'd rather use e-mail to communicate with us, and that e-mail address is premera@atq.wa.gov.

Thank you very much for coming.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis.

Now I'm going to ask, as I mentioned before, Premera Blue Cross to describe their conversion proposal in 15 minutes, and I would like to call on the chief executive officer of Premera Blue Cross, Mr. Gubby Barlow, who I understand may be calling on Mr. Milo, then, to also join in.

MR. BARLOW: Good evening, Commissioner

Page 12

Kreidler, Deputy Commissioner Odiorne, Assist Attorney General Fallis. Thank you for this opportunity to discuss our proposal to raise capital as a public company.

In the four months since we announced our proposal last spring, many people have shared with me their support and also their concerns. People ask: Why does Premera want to convert? Will Premera focus on Wall Street instead of its members? Will being for-profit cause premiums to rise or squeeze payments to physicians and hospitals? Will Premera executives get huge success bonuses when the company converts? Will we remain in rural areas of the state? Does Premera want to be taken over by an out-of-state insurer? And if not, how will we prevent it from happening?

I've also seen great interest in our proposal to dedicate 100 percent of the initial stock of the fund -- of the company to fund health initiatives in Washington and Alaska. Many people have strong opinions about how those funds should be spent, who should control the charities, and some are concerned about an accurate valuation of the company. These are important questions that deserve thorough public discussion, and I'm confident that we can address them all.

A bit about our company. Premera Blue Cross is a

Page 13

nonprofit Washington corporation, one of the largest private corporations in Washington, with 3,000 employees serving over 1.4 people in three states. Our roots go back to 1933 in Washington, 1957 in Alaska, and 1954 in Oregon. This year we're starting a new affiliate in Arizona.

So what is Premera trying to achieve as a business?

I believe that people buy health insurance for one primary reason: Peace of mind. And that's our mission, providing peace of mind to our members about their healthcare coverage. For us, delivering on that message means bringing financial stability; providing broad choices of products, physicians, hospitals; providing excellent service; and supporting growth. Growth not only responds to customer needs; it spreads our operating costs over a larger base to the benefit of all of our customers.

And because healthcare is local, we believe we can best serve our members by being an independent Washington-based company. This has been our strategy. It remains our strategy, whether we are for-profit or not-for-profit.

So why do we want to convert? Because going public creates more resources to serve our mission better. This is a highly capital-intensive business. We need capital

Page 14

to maintain our insurance reserves, to invest in new technologies and products, and to serve more members. As a nonprofit, our sources of capital are effectively limited to operating profits. Those operating margins are rather slim, last year about 1 percent of each premium dollar.

Now, we have explored other sources of capital but have rejected them. For example, another nonprofit Washington corporation health plan explored merging last year with a large health plan in Chicago. That option is not consistent with Premera's desire to remain independent and headquartered right here in Washington.

I would like to address some of those concerns that I've heard. As for the influence of Wall Street, any company that focuses on stockholders first and its customers and other stakeholders second is doomed to fail on both fronts. Our mission and dedication to our members remains the same, whether we are publicly held or not-for-profit.

Second, going public will not increase premiums or reduce fees for physicians and other providers. Today we are operate in a very competitive market, competing against for-profit companies and not-for-profits. We charge our customers the market price. We pay our physicians and hospitals what the market demands.

Clearly those market forces are independent of and unaffected by our capital structure.

Third, some conversions elsewhere have resulted in large success bonuses for executives. There will be no success bonuses if Premera converts. In the future, stock ownership plans may be offered to certain employees. But our board has yet to address this issue, and we will submit any such plan to state officials before you make a decision on our conversion.

Fourth, with some conversions in other states, there has been debate of the values of the companies. By dedicating 100 percent of the initial stock outright to health initiatives, the full worth of the company, including goodwill, is reflected. The stock market, which is the most efficient and effective arbiter of value that we know of, will determine what the value of that stock is.

Five, there are no plans to sell this company, and we remain committed to rural areas. Premera has an independent board of respected community, medical, and business leaders. Our board has repeatedly determined that we remain independent and based in Washington because that is how we can serve our members best. That's why our conversion plan incorporated all antitakeover provisions available under Washington law.

Further, the state's Holding Company Act provides additional protections. In the unlikely event that our board determined to sell, the Insurance Commissioner would be required to scrutinize any proposed sale with the same due diligence as a conversion.

As for our commitment to rural areas, our record speaks for itself. Premera's family of companies currently serves every Washington county. We have remained in many counties after other nonprofit and for-profit companies have left. When we have stopped selling products in the past, we have done so only after careful consideration. For example, we stopped selling Medicare Plus Choice last year; we did this because federal funding was inadequate to cover all costs, including fees found acceptable by physicians and hospitals.

We believe that strategically a statewide network of physicians and hospitals and a statewide presence, including our rural areas, is a valuable competitive advantage that we wish to maintain into the future.

In summary, I believe this conversion produces three great wins: It's a win for our members through increased capital to serve them better; it's a win for the state through a growing company supporting local employment and the tax base; and it's a win for the people of Washington

Page 17 and Alaska through a substantial pool of funds devoted to 1 health initiatives. Thank you very much. Now Yori Milo, one of our 3 4 executive officers, will add some details about our 5 proposal 6 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Barlow. 7 Mr. Milo? 8 MR. MILO: Thank you. Mr. Barlow explained why Premera wants to change cooperate structure, so it can access capital. I'm going 10 11 to be talking more specifically about what we're 12 proposing to do as presented in our Form A filing that's on record in the Office of the Insurance Commissioner, 13 14 that is, how we propose to reorganize to operate as a 15 stock company, as well as talking about the charitable 16 organizations we propose to establish to support the 17 health initiatives, which Mr. Barlow discussed. To do that, I would like to take a look at the 18 19 Premera family of companies as it's organized today, and then take a look at the Premera family of companies as it 20 21 would look after the proposed conversion. On the podium we have handed out, and reflected on the screen, is a 22 chart reflecting the current Premera structure. 23 24 It's a mix of both nonprofit and for-profit 25 organizations today. The green designates current

Page 18

companies which are in nonprofit form; the blue designates companies which are in for-profit form. For example, Premera Blue Cross provides health insurance coverage in Alaska and Washington, and it is, and has always been, a nonprofit corporation.

By contrast, at the lower right-hand corner of the chart, you see LifeWise of Oregon. It also sells health insurance. It's a for-profit company and it has, and always has been, a for-profit company. Similarly States West Life on the left-hand side of the chart, also a for-profit corporation. It's a life and disability insurer that sells products in Washington, Alaska, and Oregon, and is licensed in a number of other states as well.

So that brings a question: What is -- what are the key differences and what are the some of the similarities between for-profits and nonprofits? A key difference is share ownership. For-profit corporations have stock owners. Stock owners obtain their shares by paying money to the corporation, and that money goes to serve the capital needs and operating needs of a corporation. By contrast, nonprofits do not have shareholders, and as you can see, Premera in its nonprofit form has no stock owners.

While there are differences between nonprofit --

Page 19

for-profits and nonprofits, there are some important similarities between for-profits and Premera as it's organized today. Contrary to common misperception, Premera is not a tax-exempt charitable organization. It pays both federal and state taxes. In 2001 it paid over \$37 million to the State of Washington in taxes, the same amount it would have paid had it operated in 2001 in for-profit form. Similarly Premera paid over \$10 million in federal taxes in 2001.

There are also similarities in the way for-profits and nonprofits are regulated as insurers. Premera is subject to the jurisdiction of the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and regulated by the Insurance Code and regulations promulgated by the Office of the Insurance Commission. That applies today; it would apply if Premera operated in for-profit form.

Let's take a look at what the Premera family of companies would look like after the proposed reorganization. As you can see on the chart, the companies in blue on the lower portion of the chart is the same family of companies as was shown on the preceding chart, but now designated in blue to show that they're organized in for-profit form. That would be accomplished through a series of transactions that are described in detail on the Form A filing on file in the

Office of the Insurance Commissioner, those transactions being the subject approvals of the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and Attorney General.

On the chart you see several new organizations designated in green. As Mr. Barlow said, 100 percent of the initial stock would be dedicated to support health initiatives in Alaska and Washington. That would be done by transferring 100 percent of the initial stock of the public company, New Premera, transferring it to a charitable foundation, shown on the chart as a foundation shareholder.

The purpose of the foundation shareholder is to hold and sell that stock and to assure that the proceeds are used to support Washington and Alaska health initiatives. That would be done by transferring the proceeds of the sale of stock to two new organizations, a Washington charitable organization, shown on the top left of the chart, and an Alaska charitable organization, the distribution to be done in an allocation to be agreed between the states of Washington and Alaska.

The two new charitable organizations which would hold the proceeds and conduct the charitable activities would be completely independent of Premera. Premera would have no role on the board of directors of those organizations or any contractual relationship with those

organizations.

The purposes of those organizations are proposed in our Form A filing. Some of the purposes, for example, that Premera has proposed is to address unmet healthcare needs of the uninsured populations of these states; to educate physicians, nurses, and other caregivers who are committed to underserved areas; and to generally create a legacy endowment to improve the health of the local communities in these states.

The Form A filing also recognizes that we're looking to state officials to help finalize the purposes of these charitable organizations, and ask that state officials seek input from the community at large to help determine the final purposes of these charitable organizations.

With that, we talked about the charities. As

Mr. Barlow said, the purposes of that reorganization is
so that Premera and the Premera family of companies can
access the equity markets to raise capital to support
their operating needs and capital reserves. That would
be done by New Premera issuing and selling new stock in
the public markets, the proceeds of which would go to
fund New Premera in its operations.

With that, I would like to thank the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and Office of the Attorney General for giving us the opportunity to make this presentation.

1 And that concludes our presentation. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
3 Mr. Milo.

Now we are at the position or point in the meeting where we have a chance to hear from the public. Let me just outline some brief rules for that purpose. As we have this desk right in front of us, I would ask you, when I call your name, to come forward and state your name clearly. If you would even be kind enough to spell your last name, it would be of great assistance to the court reporter who is recording the information. If you can speak slowly, that will be very much appreciated, particularly by her in making an accurate record of this meeting and the questions and comments that you have to offer.

As you come forward, we are going to ask you -- and when you begin to speak, if you have prepared comments, if they're extensive, you may want to summarize them.

You can give those over here to our timekeeper. We would allocate up to five minutes for speaker. The purpose for that is to make sure that each individual has an opportunity to offer their comments.

We've designed these forums very specifically to be very early in the process so that we have an opportunity to hear from the public. There will be further

Page 23

opportunity to hear from individuals once we, as

Mr. Odiorne pointed out, have the expert information that
will be available to the public, and we would initiate
that second round of public hearings.

I am not -- we are not, I should point out, prepared to answer questions, engage in rebuttals, or debate this evening. We have many questions ourselves. Our purpose here is to hear your questions and comments as you -- as we begin the process of this review.

So I'm going to begin the meeting now, and I have a few comments I'll offer at the conclusion of public testimony and begin right -- first person who signed up indicating at least with a question mark -- and maybe you'd like to pass or come forward at this time, Ian Timm.

MR. TIMM: Commissioner Kreidler, for the record, my name is Ian Timm. I'm the executive director of the Oregon Primary Care Association. I signed in with a question because it was unclear if you were expecting testimony pro or con at this point in the proceedings.

But I -- from what I could gather in reviewing some of the documents available on your Web page, I did have some questions, and I think the presentation we just heard put a clearer focus on some of my questions.

The structure proposed -- well, I guess before I get

into the structure, I think the main question is whether the conversion is in the public interest at all. And the -- whether it's in the public interest or not, I think they've made a good case as to why they think it's in the interests of the corporation or the corporations.

But I don't think they've really made a good presentation for why it's in the public interest. It certainly would allow them more room to participate in the capital marketplace, but I don't think I've heard a good case as to why there is an unalloyed benefit to the shareholders or the people seeking access to health insurance in their market areas. And so I think that's one question is: What is the case?

They did make reference to the other Blue Cross in Washington seeking to merge or convert in the recent past along with the Regence family of corporations. And some in Oregon where that -- some of the hearings took place and where I assume a decision was made not to pursue that, had the interpretation that that conversion was withdrawn when it became clear that the Insurance Commissioner and the authorities in Oregon were expecting a fair valuation, and that fair valuation to be set aside into a charitable foundation. So I applaud your attempt to get an independent valuation of this transaction.

Which leads me to a question about the structure and

in particular the foundation-shareholder scheme which is proposed, which appears -- seems like it raises a question of why that particular box is even necessary. It seems to be a holding -- a holding point for the assets of the existing corporations and to be controlled by the existing corporations.

The papers I read, although I can't -- don't claim to understand them thoroughly 'cause I haven't had enough time to make that claim -- but it appeared that there were ample provisions for how the New Premera corporation would direct the foundation shareholder to act, but no really real provisions for the foundation shareholder to have any independent life.

And so it raised -- in fact, the articles and the bylaws for that define the word independent as former and current employees of one Premera corporation or another, hardly the community standard for independent of a nonprofit corporation. It's not what most people, if you did a poll, would think the word independent meant, but they've defined it, for their purposes, as meaning that.

So I think there's really no attempt to assert that the proceeds from the conversion will go into an independent foundation; they're going to go into a something. I'm not sure what sort of foundation -- what sort of standing that sort of entity might have under

Page 26

Washington state law, but it's certainly new to me. But I'm not an expert on corporate structure, but it does raise some questions which, as a consumer, you may want to look into.

And that also raises the questions of: If the foundation shareholder is going to be in charge of converting the shares into cash for subsequent transfer to the charitable foundations, it seems like there's not a -- not any clear protections for the public in those conversion transactions. There's some parameters stated, but it's not clear whether the incentives would be aligned to sell shares high or sell them low or whether there's any oversight wanted or contemplated in that process, which --

So I think you need to assure the public that this foundation shareholder is not a scheme to avoid the obligations commonly assumed for the creation of a foundation, when you are converting nonprofit assets to a for-profit status. So I guess those are the questions I have.

And although I understand that residents of Oregon may not have much standing in this process, the nature of the conversion and the size of the market share of Premera will certainly have collateral effects on the health insurance marketplace in Oregon. There are many

Page 27

markets where the people freely move back and forth between the two states, and so I think that the question of future corporate behavior and its effect on the marketplace and access to healthcare certainly could have a collateral effect on Oregonians, even though LifeWise Premera in Oregon is already for-profit status.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Timm.

Let me point out that, just by way of information to you -- you can certainly step down if you would like -- is that part of why we're retaining the experts that Mr. Odiorne described here is that, when we do another round of hearings, we're going to have the analysis to many of the questions you've raised.

But by asking the questions you've asked tonight, you've helped to focus us to make sure that our experts are providing us with the directed answers to the issues that you've raised. So it is appreciated. It will be part of the record, and it will help us. When we come back with the next round, we'll have the kind of information that can be much more specific in being able to make sure the concerns you've raised have been satisfactorily answered, or whether there are other questions that might need to be asked.

Next person I would like to call on: Sally Timm,

Page 28 1 did you wish to --MS. TIMM: No, thank you. I'm fine. I came to learn. 3 4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Great. I would like to call on Dr. Todd Bernstein. 5 DR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you. Commissioner 6 7 Kreidler, Deputy Commissioner Odiorne, and Assistant 8 Attorney General Fallis, I would like to thank you guys for coming to Vancouver. I'm here tonight as a private citizen, as a consumer 10 11 being insured by Premera, as well as by a local surgeon 12 in a small independent medical practice. And I came to voice my concern. 13 14 I applaud the Deputy Commissioner's statement that 15 this should not be rushed and that we really need to take a long, hard look at what is going on and the motives and 16 the outcomes, for we've all purchased things quickly and 17 been left with things that haven't worked for us. 18 19 The Washington State Medical Association has raised 20 some issues, and I've looked at those and really echoed 21 those in my own practice as certain products, like 22 Healthy Options and some of the welfare products and the 23 underserved products, have by other insurers been dropped 24 because of the difficulty in meeting expectations for

remunerations. And as a local practitioner, we have

25

absorbed a lot of that difficulty and a lot of that shortfall.

And I'm concerned as insurers in general or as businesses, in even a broader sense, move from a not-for-profit to a for-profit format, that some of the lesser fortunate and unprivileged and the welfare patients may be left swinging in the breeze. We as physicians went into practice and went into medicine to help people, and we are shouldering more and more of the difficulties of the most needy and the least financially resourced patients.

And so I think it would be really important for us all to look at this process and to see if certain services or certain specialties might not, according to the structure, be pushed off to the foundation to allow a for-profit corporation to do just what the name states.

And I know that in the Commissioner's Office, and in the state as a whole, we're all looking very carefully at this proposal because we think, as our insurer, as Premera is a Washington company, we really want it to flourish because it's an insurer that we've chosen. But we also, I think, need to tread very carefully at looking at the increased workload for physicians and the increased workload for hospitals and increased workload for the health industry in general and perhaps the

- decreased service for those who need it most.
- 2 Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Doctor.

As I pointed out to Mr. Timm, and as you referenced also, Doctor, on the timing issue, let me reassure you, even though we put together a preliminary time schedule as to how this would be completed, it was never intended that this would be the final say unless we have all of the information.

It's clear from our negotiations with the experts -and the experts that Mr. Odiorne described here are ones
who have experience in other states, where they've gone
through similar conversion processes -- until we have all
of the information we need to make an informed decision,
I can assure you, no decision will be made.

So that timing is clearly not going to be -- the preliminary schedule going to be what's going to work. It's going to take longer. I wouldn't be surprised if we wouldn't be able to hold the second round of hearings until after the first of the year. It would be nice if we could do it sooner, but we want to make sure we have the right information to make the right decision.

Next I would like to call on Rocky Beckner.

- Mr. Beckner passes.
- 25 And Jane Young.

1 MS. YOUNG: Commissioner Kreidler, my husband 2 will read our comments, which are signed by both of us.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: That would be great. If you would just identify yourself, for the record.

MR. YOUNG: George Young, Vancouver. I'm here as a consumer. Digress for a moment in history. I first became customer of Blue Cross in 1951. So it's 50 years, 51 years.

With the exceptions of a couple of times in corporate decisions where we were not covered under Blue Cross, which I didn't have other any problem, but others in the corporation did. My personal experience has only been with Blue Cross satisfactory, from major to minor.

When I hit Medicare and I looked for the supplement on the thing, I checked with the clinic's accounting department, asked them who was the fairest, the best to work with; they said Blue Cross. I went with Blue Cross. Couple of major problems; I've been very happy about them all through.

That said, we are against the conversion. We recommend -- we remember reading that there are in excess of 1500 health insurance organizations in the United States, each with a set of senior managements, each enjoying the sundry perks of their positions. We have the opinion that our total health care -- total health

disaster's only answer is a program comparable to Medicare.

If the conversion is completed, we will once again see a bleeding off of dollar assets being used for management's personal benefit, not to the subscribers. As retirees from the corporate world, we have observed and been adversely affected by corporate chicanery. Rather than a long litany of detailed abuses, we call your attention to the current problems attendant to Enron, Arthur Anderson, Qwest, WorldCom, ad infinitum. We planned to attend this meeting (inaudible) plan believes.

My concern is what is going to happen in the future. Blue Cross has a fantastic record, as far as we're concerned; very happy with it. But what's going to happen in the future? And to take a look at what's happening on Wall Street, I don't think any more needs to be said.

Incidentally, this has gone via e-mail to your Olympia office.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Great. Thank you very much, Mr. Young.

If there's an individual who, after listening to the testimony, does desire to testify this evening, if you could step outside. Diane, standing right over here,

Page 33 1 would be glad to take your name so we make sure we call on you. Next person on the list here is Sil Arata. 4 MR. ARATA: I would pass, Commissioner. 5 want to clarify one piece. And that is, on your second round of hearings, are you coming to Vancouver? 6 7 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Mr. Arata asked if we 8 were planning to come to Vancouver on our second round of hearings. It is yet it be finalized whether we will be I know that at least there will be one hearing, 10 here. 11 another one in Seattle, another one in Spokane. 12 had one other in Eastern Washington. We'll have another one in Western Washington. Whether it's in Vancouver or 13 14 Bellingham is yet to be finalized at this point, but 15 there -- it remains to be seen effectively right now. 16 We're working with the schedule and trying to make sure that we reach as many consumers as we possibly can as a 17 18 part of this conversion process. 19 MR. ARATA: Thank you. 20 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Surely. Al Fallat? 21 22 Thank you for the invitation to MR. FALLAT: address the panel. My name is Andrew Fallat, 23 F-a-l-l-a-t. I'm the chief executive officer of the 24 25 Foundation for Healthcare Quality, a not-for-profit

corporation here in the State of Washington. My purpose tonight is to request that, in the event the OIC and the Attorney General do approve the conversion, that the OIC and Attorney General require that the charitable foundation that be created support activities that directly improve statewide the quality of clinical care.

In 1988 the Foundation for Healthcare Quality was formed with the concurrence of the state government, federal participants, physicians, payers, patients, and hospitals. It was created with the single belief that quality of care was improved when the all the partners in the system had a trusted environment where they could address their issues honestly and without fear of either reprisal or in the midst of a bilateral negotiation. And it was -- the purpose was to collect information regarding clinical care.

And what was discovered in 1988 was that different parties have different reasons or initiatives or motivation, usually positive, but not considered in the whole. Take for example a hospital that would have an incentive to produce good quality care because it's the right thing to do; it's what you're there to do in your community.

But you also want to maintain your license. You also want to satisfy Medicare certification, and so you

Page 35

can spin off and do things that are strictly for Medicare certification, not necessarily thinking about how it might affect physicians in your community or how a payer might be concerned or interested in that particular activity. Not that it's counter to their interests, but just not considered, so there would be unintended consequences.

Hospitals maintain and physicians maintain quality to manage their own risks and liability. It's a good thing to do. But we've learned throughout the years, and especially over the last decade, that total quality management asks us to think outside of the box of our own institution, to look at the broader system. A single individual hospital or single payer trying to improve the quality of care of the entire state can't do it on the shoulders, on their own shoulders or on their own single initiative.

And so in this state in 1988, we created the Foundation for Healthcare Quality, which I've been a board member of for some time, but only the CEO for a few months. So I guess I'm speaking not so much from a personal interest, but from an interest as a 25-year citizen of this state to watch what the foundation has done.

Today the Foundation for Healthcare Quality -- and

there could be other organizations similar that could be sponsored by the foundation as well as other charitable things. But the Foundation for Healthcare Quality operates -- I believe the premier statewide clinical improvement program known as Clinical Outcome Assessment Program or COPE.

Every hospital in this state, with the concurrence of the state government and all the payers and all the hospitals and the physicians, all of those partners gather together to create -- to define the kind of data which would detail clinical quality as it relates to cardiac surgery and cardiac care.

That information is shared in the state. It's collected. It's scrubbed. It's analyzed for statistical validity. And it's shared back with -- to the hospitals and physicians so that they can identify areas where they can improve the quality over time. Not for the purposes -- there's no review for licensure. This is not related to risk management. This is related to the commitment that people have to improve the quality for the patients in Washington State.

More -- we received requests to expand this program and don't have the resources to do so. But if the Insurance Commissioner and the Attorney General deem that a healthcare foundation were to be established in this

Page 37 state as a result of a conversion, if you were to see 1 that, I would like you to consider as a requirement that that foundation sponsor and support statewide initiatives 4 to improve every day in the quality of care that's 5 provided by our valued physicians and hospitals. 6 Thank you very much. 7 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, 8 Mr. Fallat. Call on Mike Becker. 9 MR. BECKER: Commissioner Kreidler, Deputy 10 11 Commissioner Odiorne, and Assist AG Fallis, my name, for 12 the record, is Mike Becker. I'm vice president of public policy for Regence Blue Cross Blue Shield of Oregon. 13 14 I'm not here today to speak in favor of or against 15 the proposal by Premera, and I had no intention of 16 speaking at all today except, after hearing the 17 testimony, there were a number of points or two points that I thought definitely needed clearing up. And that 18 19 had to do with a comment made by Mr. Barlow and by Mr. Timm in regard to the Regence' proposed affiliation 20 21 with the Illinois-Texas plans in the Blue Cross Blue 22 Shield system. Mr. Barlow referred to that as a -- I believe the 23 24 term he used was a "merger," and Mr. Timm similarly

25

referred to it as a "merger and conversion." That is --

it couldn't be farther from the truth. No conversion was proposed. Regence Blue Cross Blue Shield of Oregon and other Regence plans are not-for-profit plans, as are the Texas-Illinois plans. It is an affiliation that was proposed in that transaction, virtually identical to the affiliation that brought the Regence groups of plans together originally in the mid-1990s.

So I just want to clear that up for the record that this was not a conversion; it was not a merger; it was an affiliation. It was called off because of the original objectives of that affiliation, after further analysis, could not be achieved. And the parties decided to withdraw that proposal.

Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
Mr. Becker. I knew it was an affiliation. I certainly
did.

MR. BECKER: I knew you did.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: That does conclude the list of individuals who'd indicated a desire to speak this evening.

Let me just conclude by saying that this is the last of four in a series of hearings that we held around the state for very preliminary, initial wanting to here from the public about the nature of this filing, from

questions and concerns that they had, and to begin the process of trying to make sure that we develop -- the information we need in order -- or I need in order to make a decision as a judge on the issue of conversion, and if I were to agree that a conversion was appropriate, then what we should look to in the way of a charitable activity that would be associated with that conversion activity or filing.

Let me say that any information, Mr. Fallis from the Attorney General's Office has pointed out, we also have on the Insurance Commissioner's Web site a conversion logo on there where, if you hit that, you're going to be able to either introduce your own comments via e-mail, or you can find out any of the information that has currently been filed with our office, including all of the documentation that we have received to date as part of the formal filing from Premera Blue Cross relative to their requested conversion and form filing.

All of that information, some close-to-2000 pages, I believe, have been posted so far. More information will be posted directly as a part of the filing as it comes in. In addition to that, then, all the expert information will be available. The transcript from this meeting will be eventually posted on that Web site. I believe we already have Seattle. I believe Spokane is

already posted. Shortly we will have the Tri-Cities transcript of that hearing also posted on there.

Comments that are submitted to us via e-mail or telephone or any other written, any communications we receive, will also be posted and made an official part of the record. I would urge you to go to that Web site if you have any questions or would like to follow and track the process as it goes forward.

I take this filing very seriously. It has been a significant issue, as Mr. Odiorne pointed out, in other states when this has taken place. It has significant ramifications for the public. Decisions that are made here are not infrequently going to be challenged in the courts, either -- no matter what decision we make. So it's an extremely important issue, and I take it extremely seriously as we go forward.

The number-one issue that I am concerned about is making sure that the consumers of the State of Washington are not harmed. And until we have satisfactory information to make a judgment on that issue, we won't be bringing a judgment. A final decision, as the judge of that, will be rendered by me.

I want to again extend my appreciation to you for coming forward this evening, helping us to frame some of the questions and concerns you have. As we go forward,

## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

	Page 41
1	you've assisted us in this process. We look forward to
2	being able to have another round of public hearings
3	before we have a formal hearing process in the process of
4	rendering of the final decision.
5	Thank you very much for coming this evening on
6	behalf of Mr. Rusty Fallis and his boss, Attorney General
7	Christine Gregoire, Attorney General for the State of
8	Washington, and Mr. Odiorne, my Deputy, and myself.
9	Thank you so much for coming this evening.
10	Meeting adjourned.
11	(Proceedings concluded at 7:02 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 42
1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, SUE E. GARCIA, a duly authorized Court Reporter and
3	Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at
4	Tacoma, do hereby certify:
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on
6	the 15th of October, 2002, and thereafter transcribed by me by
7	means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a
8	full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;
9	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
10	counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of
11	any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
14	affixed my official seal this October 17, 2002.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR
	GA-RC-IS-E305QB